

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,591	05/19/2005	Jan-Willem Van De Waerdt	US020465	7635
24737 PHILIPS INTE	7590 05/07/200 CLLECTUAL PROPER	EXAM	EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			CYGIEL, GARY W	
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2188 .	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		I.	05/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/535,591	VAN DE WAERDT ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gary W. Cygiel	2188
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNION (R. 1.136(a)). In no event, however, may a residual will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19     This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ T     Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	his action is non-final. wance except for formal matt	•
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the applicat 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are witho 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	drawn from consideration.	
Application Papers	•	*
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Exam 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 19 May 2005 is/are:  Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor 11)⊠ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	a) accepted or b) ⊠ object the drawing(s) be held in abeyar rection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). i(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/19/2005</u>.</li> </ol>	Paper No(	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application

Art Unit: 2188

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Drawings**

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the titles of the structures in Fig 6a as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Application/Control Number: 10/535,591 Page 3

Art Unit: 2188

The examiner notes that two sets of drawings were submitted on the same day.

The set of drawings without any labels and thus subject to similar objections as listed above will not be considered.

## Claim Objections

- 2. Claims 1,10-11,13 and 16 objected to because of the following informalities:
  - A. Claim 10: The use of –and address field-- is not correct.
  - Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 15 is directed towards a method according to Claim 13, but Claim 13 is directed towards an apparatus.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/535,591

Art Unit: 2188

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-2,4-9,10-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sherwood et al. [NPL:Predictor-Directed Stream Buffers] (hereinafter referred to as Sherwood).

#### Consider Claim 1,

Sherwood teaches a method of data retrieval comprising the steps of:

providing a first memory circuit (Fig 3);

providing a stride prediction table (SPT) (Fig 3, Sec 4.2);

providing cache memory circuit (Fig 3);

executing instructions for accessing data within the first memory (Instructions must be executed to access data within the first memory.);

detecting a cache miss (Sec 4.3 ¶3, detects two cache misses in a row); and accessing and updating the SPT only when a cache miss is detected (Sec 4.3 ¶3m, two-miss allocation filter.).

#### Consider Claims 2 and 16,

Sherwood teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein the cache memory circuit is a stream buffer (Fig 3).

#### Consider Claim 4,

Application/Control Number: 10/535,591

Art Unit: 2188

Sherwood teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein the cache memory circuit and the

SPT are within a same physical memory space (Fig 3).

### Consider Claim 5,

Sherwood teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein the first memory is an external

memory circuit separate from a processor executing the instructions (Fig 3,data line from/to next lower level of memory.).

#### ·Consider Claims 6 and 7,

Sherwood teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein the step of detecting a cache miss

includes the steps of:

determining whether an instruction to be executed by the processor is a memory access instruction;

when the instruction is a memory access instruction, determining whether data at a memory location of the memory access instruction is present within the cache; and,

when the data is other than present within the cache, detecting a cache miss, and accessing and updating the SPT only when the cache miss has occurred (Sec 4.3 ¶3, a cache miss occurs when a requested memory line is not in the cache, therefore requiring the first two limitations of these claims.)

Consider Claim 8,

Sherwood teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the step of accessing

provides a step

of filtering that prevents unnecessary access and updates to entries within the SPT

(Sec 4.3).

Consider Claim 10,

Sherwood teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the SPT comprises

and address field, and where a size of the address field is less than an address space

used to index the SPT (Sec 4.2 ¶5, Table tag size can be reduced by storing only

partial address tags.).

Consider Claim 11,

Sherwood teaches an apparatus comprising:

a stride prediction table (SPT) (Fig 3,Sec 4.2); and

a filter circuit for use with the SPT, the filter circuit for determining instance

wherein the SPT is to be accessed and updated, the instances only occurring when a

cache miss is detected (Sec 4.3 ¶3).

Consider Claim 12,

Art Unit: 2188

Sherwood teaches an apparatus according to claim 11 comprising a memory circuit, the memory circuit for storing the SPT therein (Fig 3).

### Consider Claim 13,

Sherwood teaches an apparatus according to claim 12 comprising a cache memory, the cache memory residing within the memory circuit (Fig 3).

#### Consider Claim 14,

Sherwood teaches an apparatus according to claim 13, wherein the memory circuit is a single ported memory circuit (Fig 3, Markov Predictor has single input and single output, Handling a single request at a time.)

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Application/Control Number: 10/535,591 Page 8

Art Unit: 2188

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claims 3,9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherwood et al. [NPL:Predictor-Directed Stream Buffers] (hereinafter referred to as Sherwood) in view of Handy [NPL: the Cache Memory book] (hereinafter referred to as Handy).

Consider Claim 3,9 and 15,

Sherwood teaches a method according to claim 1 or 13 respectively, but does not specifically disclose all the details regarding the circuits construction.

Handy does teach these limitations such as:

wherein the cache memory circuit is a random access cache memory (Handy:Page 28, SRAM cell used in internal cache.)

wherein the cache memory circuit is integral with the processor executing the instructions (Handy:Page 28, CPU on same chip as on-chip cache.)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the circuit construction concepts as taught by Handy in the system of Sherwood because they are notoriously well known concepts in the art.

The use of these methods constitutes only design choice and has no novelty in the art.

## <u>Conclusion</u>

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Application/Control Number: 10/535,591

Art Unit: 2188

Page 9

A. Breche [WIPO: International Search Report] detailed search report for instant application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary W. Cygiel whose telephone number is (571)270-1170. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursdays 11:00am-3:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough can be reached on (571)272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1008

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINES

4-27-07

Gary WCygiel

Art Unit 2188